



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,556	01/10/2002	Wilfried Lubisch	33827-US-009	2746

26474 7590 01/06/2004
KEIL & WEINKAUF
1350 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/041,556

Applicant(s)

LUBISCH ET AL.

Examiner

Brenda L. Coleman

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Oath/Declaration

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
The specification to which the oath or declaration is directed has not been adequately identified. See MPEP § 601.01(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable

Art Unit: 1624

one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It is the Wands factors, which are used to evaluate the enablement question. In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988); Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

The nature of the invention in the instant case, has claims which embrace benzo[b]imidazo[4,5,1-jk][1,4]benzodiazepin-6(7H)-one compounds. The scope of "prodrug" is not adequately enabled. Applicants provide no guidance as how the compounds are made more active in vivo. The choice of a "prodrug" will vary from drug to drug. Therefore, more than minimal routine experimentation would be required to determine which prodrug will be suitable for the instant invention.

The instant compounds of formula (I) wherein the prodrugs are not described in the disclosure in such a way the one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to prepare the various compounds suggested by claims 1-7. In view of the lack of direction provided in the specification regarding starting materials, the lack of working examples, and the general unpredictability of chemical reactions, it would take an undue amount of experimentation for one skilled in the art to make the claimed compounds and therefore practice the invention.

4. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable

Art Unit: 1624

one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 9 and 10 embraces any neurodegenerative disease, microinfarction, revascularization of critically stenosed coronary arteries or critically stenosed peripheral arteries, acute myocardial infarction and damage during and after its medicinal or mechanical lysis, tumours and their metastases, multiorgan failure, immunological disease and/or viral infection. The scope of the method claims are not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitors provided in the specification. Bürkle, BioEssays states that the pathophysiology of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitors is such that the following diseases and/or disorders are known to be associated with poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase, i.e. Diabetes mellitus, Ischaemia-reperfusion damage in brain, heart, kidney and bowel, Septic and haemorrhagic shock, and Acute and chronic inflammatory disorders. Bürkle further suggests the possible association of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitors in the area of cytotoxic tumour therapy.

However, evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer was not found sufficient to establish the enablement of claims directed to a method of treating seven types of cancer with members of a class of several compounds In re Buting 163 USPQ 689. The remarkable advances in chemotherapy have seen the development of specific compounds to treat specific types of cancer. The great diversity of diseases falling within the "tumor" category means that it is contrary to medical understanding that any agent (let alone a genus of thousands of compounds) could be generally

Art Unit: 1624

effective against such diseases. The intractability of these disorders is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task.

There never has been a compound capable of treating cancer generally. There are compounds that treat a range of cancers, but no one has ever been able to figure out how to get a compound to treat cancer generally, or even a majority of cancers. Thus, the existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding in oncology. Even the most broadly effective anti-tumor agents are only effective against a small fraction of the vast number of different cancers known. This is true in part because cancers arise from a wide variety of sources, such as viruses (e.g. EBV, HHV-8, and HTLV-1), exposure to chemicals such as tobacco tars, genetic disorders, ionizing radiation, and a wide variety of failures of the body's cell growth regulatory mechanisms. Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body, and different vulnerabilities. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally, evidence that the level of skill in this art is low relative to the difficulty of such a task.

Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied upon are reasonably predictive of in vivo efficacy by those skilled in the art. See *In re Ruskin*, 148 USPQ 221; *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907; MPEP 2164.05(a).

Patent Protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. Tossing

Art Unit: 1624

out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk 42 USPQ2d 1001.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

a) Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of B where B is L_v-Y-M_w where w is 0. Y is a divalent moiety and when w is 0 there is nothing attached to Y.

b) Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of E where two of the moieties are missing the point of attachment, i.e. $NHSO_2^-$ and $-NHCOCH_2X^4$.

c) Claim 3 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of B where B is thiophene.

d) Claims 6 and 7 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the definition of R^4 where R^4 is $G^1-F^1_0, -G^2-G^3$.

e) Claim 6 recites the limitation " $G^1-F^1_0, -G^2-G^3$ " in the definition of R^4 .

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The definition of R^4 in claim 1 from which claim 6 depends is $-(D)_p-(E)_s-(F^1)_q-G^1-(F^2)_r-G^2-G^3$. Hence, F^1 is never to the right of G^1 .

Art Unit: 1624

f) Claim 9 provides for the use of the compounds according to claim 8, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

g) Claim 10 provides for the method of use of the compounds of claim 1, which is unclear as to whether this is indicative of a subject in need thereof.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd. App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1624

7. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by BRESLIN et al., Journal of Medicinal Chemistry. Breslin teaches the compounds and compositions of the compounds of formula I where X¹ is O, A is benzo, R¹ is H and B is SH. See compound 1ax in Table 1.


Claim Objections

8. Claim 12 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must be in the alternative. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda L. Coleman whose telephone number is 703-305-1880. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached on 703-308-4716. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.


Brenda Coleman
Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624
December 31, 2003